DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 125 461 HE 008 034

TITLE Reform in the State Budgeting of Postsecondary Education. Reports of the San Diego Seminar "Innovation, Outcomes, and the State Budgeting Process" and the San Francisco Conference "State Funding of Postsecondary Education: Incentives for Improvement."

INSTITUTION George Washington Univ., Washington, D.C. Inst. for Educational Leadership.

PUB DATE Jun 76

NOTE 43p.; Proceedings of the seminar "Innovation, Outcomes, and the State Budgeting Process" (San Diego, California, March 1976) and the conference "State Funding of Postsecondary Education: Incentives for Improvement" (San Francisco, California, July 1975)

AVAILABLE FROM The Postsecondary Education Convening Authority, Suite 310, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Budgeting; Educational Benefits; *Educational Finance; Educational Objectives; *Government Role; Higher Education; Innovation; *Post Secondary Education; *State Government

ABSTRACT

The seminar on "Innovation, Outcomes, and the State Budgeting Process" was a joint effort of seven organizations (Education Commission of the States, Legis 50/The Center for Legislative Improvement, National Association of State Budget Officers, National Center for Higher Education Management Systems at WICHE, National Conference of State Legislatures, and the National Governors Conference), which share an interest in the issues of performance budgeting in postsecondary education. Along with a synthesis of the seminar, the agenda, and a list of participants, a report, "State Governments as Funders of Postsecondary Education: Catalysts for Improvement?" presented at the July conference in San Francisco, is provided. (KE)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED125461

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

REFORM IN THE STATE BUDGETING OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

Reports of the

San Diego Seminar
"Innovation, Outcomes and the State Budgeting Process"

and the

San Francisco Conference
"State Funding of Postsecondary Education:
Incentives for Improvement"

June, 1976

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The Postsecondary Education Convening Authority
Suite 310, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036
202 833-2745

HE008034

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

ADVISORY BOARD

CHAIRPERSON – DR. BERNICE SANDLER
Director, Project on the Status and Education of Women
Association of American Colleges, Washington, D.C.

K.Z. CHAVIS
Program Director
Leadership Development Program, Atlanta

DR. JOHN DAVIS
President, Macalester College
Saint Paul, Minnesota

DR. JOHN DUNWORTH
President
George Peabody College, Nashville

DR. LLOYD ELLIOTT
President
The George Washington University

DR. MICHAEL FAY
Director
United Teachers' Los Angeles Urban Project

FRANCIS KEPPEL
Director
Aspen Institute Education Program

HONORABLE HOWARD KLEBANOFF
Chairman, House Education Committee
Hartford, Connecticut

RUTH MANCUSO
Chairperson
New Jersey State Board of Education

RUBY G. MARTIN
General Counsel, Committee on the District of Columbia
U.S. House of Representatives

DR. LOUIS H. MAYO
Vice President for Policy Studies and Special Projects
The George Washington University

HARRY McPHERSON, JR.
Attorney, Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE JOHN PITTENGER
Secretary of Education
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

LOIS RICE
Vice President
College Entrance Examination Board

HONORABLE MARY RIEKE
Oregon State Representative

DR. ALAN ROSENTHAL
Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University

DR. PAUL B. SALMON
Executive Director
American Association of School Administrators

DR. RICHARD C. SNYDER
Mershon Professor of Education and Public Policy
Ohio State University

DR. CHARLES WATTS
President
Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pennsylvania

DR. PAUL N. YLVISAKER
Dean, Harvard Graduate School of Education

INSTITUTE STAFF

SAMUEL HALPERIN – Director
DIETRA ROGERS – Chief Administrative Officer
JUNE FRANK – Budget Officer

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
SHARON ENRIGHT – Director
DONNA GOLD – Assistant Director

THE ASSOCIATES PROGRAM
JAMES BROWNE – Coordinator

EDUCATION POLICY FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM
PAUL SCHINDLER –Director

"OPTIONS IN EDUCATION" OVER NATIONAL PUBLIC RADIO
JOHN MERROW – Executive Producer

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION CONVENING AUTHORITY
KENNETH C. FISCHER – Director
MARILYN KRESSEL – Project Coordinator

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON WOMEN IN EDUCATION
ALICE G. SARGENT – Coordinator

CAREER EDUCATION POLICY PROJECT
GEORGE KAPLAN – Coordinator

INSTITUTE FOR
EDUCATIONAL
LEADERSHIP

THE
GEORGE
WASHINGTON
UNIVERSITY

Suite 310
1001 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Samuel Halperin
Director
(202) 833-1737

•

Education Policy
Fellowship Program
(202) 223-3415

Educational Staff Seminar
(202) 293-3160

The Associates Program
(202) 785-4991

Leadership Training Institute
(202) 833-9051

Postsecondary Education
Convening Authority
(202) 833-2745

"Options on Education"
over National
Public Radio
(202) 833-9178

Preface

The Institute for Educational Leadership's Postsecondary Education Convening Authority is pleased to publish this report of a seminar on "Innovation, Outcomes, and the State Budgeting Process" held in San Diego, March 22 - 24, 1976. PECA commissioned Marvin W. Peterson, Associate Professor of Higher Education at The University of Michigan, to be the "eyes and ears" of the seminar and to prepare a report which captured the essence of the convening. Also included are an agenda and a list of participants.

The seminar was a joint effort of seven organizations which share an interest in the issues of performance review and performance budgeting in postsecondary education. In addition to PECA, the groups include:

Education Commission of the States (ECS)
Legis 50/The Center for Legislative Improvement
National Association of State Budget Officers (NASBO)
National Center for Higher Education Management Systems as WICHE (NCHEMS)
National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL)
National Governors' Conference (NGC)

PECA appreciates the contributions of John Folger, Warren Hill, Dennis Jones, Elton McQuery, Sidney Micek, Richard Millard, Melvin Orwig, William Pound, Kathy Sample, and James Wead in the conference planning.

In addition to the Peterson paper, three others were produced for the seminar. These papers and a set of discussion-session notes are available free by writing or calling PECA. Titles and authors are:

Who Wants Outcome Measures and Why do They Want Them?, by John Folger

Legislative Review: War, Peace or Armed Truce?, by Howard Klebanoff

Introducing Higher Education Outcome Information into the State Planning and Budgeting Process, by Sidney Micek

The San Diego seminar was one of a series of related convenings which are addressing performance and budgeting issues. PECA, ECS, and the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education jointly sponsored a conference in July, 1975, on "State Funding of Postsecondary Education: Incentives for Improvement," which served as the stimulus for the San Diego seminar. A report of the July conference, prepared by Russell Edgerton of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, was a major background paper for the San Diego seminar, and is included in this publication.

The summer 1976 meeting of the State Higher Education Executive Officers will include a seminar on these issues and ECS's Inservice Education Program is planning a fall 1976 San Diego follow-up conference with the active participation of the Association of Governing Boards and the groups which co-sponsored the San Diego seminar. The Inservice Education Program and the National Association of State Budget Officers co-sponsored a seminar in December, 1975, on "Making Decisions in a Time of Fiscal Stringency".

PECA has published four reports during the past year on issues related to state licensing, state financing, and adult learning. Single copies are free and can be obtained by writing or calling PECA. Titles and authors are:

Approaches to State Licensing of Private Degree-Granting Institutions, The Airlie Conference Report

The Incentive Grant Approach in Higher Education: A 15 Year Record, by Martin Finkelstein

A Synthesis of the Clearwater Conference for Directors of State Studies of Adult Education, by James M. Heffernan

Government Funding Policies and Nontraditional Programs, by Richard Meeth

PECA is supported by a grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education.

Kenneth Fischer
Director
Postsecondary Education Convening Authority

"INNOVATION, OUTCOMES, AND THE STATE BUDGETING PROCESS"

San Diego, California
March 22 - 24, 1976

TABLE OF CONTENTS

page

Preface i

Table of Contents iii

I. A SYNTHESIS OF THE SAN DIEGO SEMINAR:
"INNOVATION, OUTCOMES, AND THE STATE BUDGETING PROCESS"
By Marvin W. Peterson 1

II. Final Agenda 14

III. Final List of Participants 16

IV. STATE GOVERNMENTS AS FUNDERS OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION:
CATALYSTS FOR IMPROVEMENT?

INSTITUTE FOR
EDUCATIONAL
LEADERSHIP

THE
GEORGE
WASHINGTON
UNIVERSITY

Suite 310
1001 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Samuel Halperin
Director
(202) 833-1737

•

Education Policy
Fellowship Program
(202) 223-3415

Educational Staff Seminar
(202) 293-3166

The Associates Program
(202) 785-4991

Leadership Training Institute
(202) 833-9051

Postsecondary Education
Convening Authority
(202) 833-2745

"Options on Education"
over National
Public Radio
(202) 833-9178

INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION CONVENING AUTHORITY

A SYNTHESIS OF THE SAN DIEGO SEMINAR:

"INNOVATION, OUTCOMES, AND THE STATE BUDGETING PROCESS"

Marvin W. Peterson
Associate Professor of Higher Education
The Center for the Study of Higher Education
The University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

May, 1976

THE CONFERENCE: A CONTEXT

This conference grew out of a conference jointly sponsored by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE), the Education Commission of the States (ECS), and the Postsecondary Education Convening Authority (PECA) in San Francisco in July, 1975 on "State Funding of Postsecondary Education: Incentives for Improvement." That conference featured some blunt discussions about the stagnation of institutions of postsecondary education, excessive restraints on change, increased competition for scarce resources, the sinking priority of education, and the "Brown-Dukakis ethos" in which the essential character of government services is reevaluated.

The San Francisco conference identified the following priorities for state-level action: focus on a performance orientation; establishment of steps to preserve adaptability; development of cooperative means to improve use of resources; and an emphasis on mechanisms for enhancing trust and rationality in relationships between states and institutions. The conference concluded that a performance approach was worth serious consideration and, more specifically, that its connection to budgeting should be evaluated. This became the planning focus for the conference on "Innovation, Outcomes and the State Budgeting Process" which is summarized here.

The conference planners recognized that institutional representatives, state legislators, executive budget officers, and state higher education agency staff feel substantial pressure to keep up with developments in higher education and that an "exploratory" dialogue about performance measures and budgeting would be useful. In preconference interviews conducted by NEXUS, postsecondary education's "people bank", the participants themselves indicated that their first concern was with the process by which states develop and implement outcome and performance measures either for assessment or budgetary purposes. Their second concern was to ask

some specific questions: What kinds of performance indicators or outcome measures are being used? What difficulties have different constituencies encountered in obtaining useful information? How much information and in what form should it be provided to various groups? How does one take into account outcomes that are not apparent or easily measurable?

The conference format, which was developed in conjunction with autobiographical data received from participants, provided for considerable discussion and presentation of current examples of state-level activities. Major statements by John Folger, Sid Micek and Howard Klebanoff addressed pressures for initial studies of and the legislative perspective on a performance approach. Fred Pinkham's interview with Howard Bowen, James Furman and Eileen Anderson allowed institution, state agency and state executive officers to compare perspectives. Discussion throughout the conference generally fell into seven broad problem areas which are reviewed below.

Reasons for a Performance Approach

John Folger's paper and many of the discussions that followed pointed out a number of reasons why people are looking at a performance approach both for assessment and, potentially, for budgeting. In the larger society, these reasons include the declining confidence in higher education, the size of the higher education budget which has become a major part of most states' expenditures, and the pressures of recession and inflation which are causing problems in resource allocation for state governments as well as institutions of higher education. On the state level, the extensive growth of auditing staffs in the state executive offices and, more recently, in the legislative staff area, reflect an increased concern for accountability. Within institutions of higher education nontraditional and innovative programs have felt stifled by the input- or effort-oriented budget approaches currently in vogue. Institutions faced with reduced resources must consider discontinuing ineffective as well as inefficient programs. Finally,

institutions face increasing student-consumer demands, reinforced by student-based aid, for more information about institutions and programs.

The conference discussions reflected considerable ambiguity and uncertainty about the consequences of the performance approach. Some felt that such an approach might improve the performance of higher education if it were taken seriously and critically and if it allowed for differences in institutions, programs, and state situations. However, if applied in more uniform ways, it could be stifling. Others suggested that even an attempt to provide performance indicators might improve the image of higher education. A similar concern with regaining legitimacy was seen in legislators' current interest in using performance approaches to inform their constituents about what institutions were doing with the money they were appropriating. Some feared that outcome-oriented performance approaches might be too simplistic, but legislators pointed out that the amount of information obtained to measure true performance more often led to their being flooded with data. While there was concern that outcome data might lead to further centralization by allowing higher education or state government agencies to dictate outcomes through the budget, ways in which it might lead to greater institutional autonomy by leaving management to the institutions were also suggested.

One major concern about the performance approach was that it was inevitably value-laden. Since different constituents would stress different performance criteria and might even interpret the same criteria differently, value conflicts would result. Another major concern was to avoid over confidence about the gains that some proponents claim for this approach. As might be expected, some participants were optimistic that this approach would allow higher education to get more state funds and perhaps even increase autonomy while others believed that, regardless of the budgetary process and performance criteria, higher education would receive less funding and probably lose autonomy. In the middle were those who thought that it was an approach that <u>might</u> protect quality in

a time of retrenchment, might help meet more educational needs, and might provide a way to reduce some of the conflicts among higher education policymakers.

While conclusions were hard to reach, there was substantial agreement that it would be helpful to identify problem areas as a basis for dialogue among various constituencies, that higher education needed to make a better case for its share of state funds, and that any performance approach should make changes with deliberate caution.

The Semantics Syndrome

One of the reasons for the general caution in discussing a performance approach to assessment and budgeting in higher education may be semantics. Legislators may see it as another fancy term developed by institutions to disguise the fact that nothing has changed, while institutions see it as just another faddish approach instigated by the state. Therefore, it is helpful to make some distinctions about what is really meant.

Performance measures differ from other measures used for assessment in higher education. Performance measures generally refer to the outcomes of higher education institutions or the impacts they have on students, the state, or the larger social institutions which they serve. Measures of performance can be quantitative or qualitative. They may be goal-oriented and they may assess unintended as well as intended effects or actions. Performance assessment differs from "management studies" which focus on issues of productivity and efficiency. These in turn differ from "operational reviews" which are more concerned with accuracy of data and responsible stewardship of funds and other resources. Obviously, there is a substantial overlap among these broad categories but clearly performance indicators are concerned with the effectiveness of institutions and programs.

Assessment can take a variety of forms. There are audits, which are normally regular assessments of quantifiable indicators in some standardized procedure. (In the past these have been associated with operational or fiduciary audits

or management efficiency or productivity audits.) There are intensive and comprehensive reviews which examine the real value and effectiveness of programs or institutions. Audits and reviews are usually, though not always, done by groups outside the institutions. Finally, there are self studies or assessments done by the institutions for some form of external recognition or for self improvement. All of these different kinds of assessment may include performance dimensions.

The performance assessment approach is further complicated by the fact that it is often done by a number of different institutions or agencies. At this conference, for instance, examples of audits or reviews were reported from the executive branch of government (usually the budget or finance office); from the legislature which may have separate fiscal, audit, and program evaluation staffs; and from the state higher education governance system where governing boards conduct reviews to fulfill their managerial responsibilities for spending and allocating money and coordinating boards conduct policy reviews for planning or to justify requests to the legislature. In addition, many assessments are made within institutions by institutional and analytic studies offices or other units and external reviews are conducted by accrediting agencies.

In adopting a performance approach it is necessary to obtain some agreement on what the terms mean and what agencies and groups are involved in each state. This is more easily accomplished when specific questions are asked about performance, when the indicators used are precisely identified, and when there is a clear understanding of the institutional program being assessed and the roles and functions of the parties involved.

The Guidance System: Concern for Consensus or Control?

In his book, The Active Society, Amitai Etzioni distinguishes the capacity of social systems to reach a consensus or make decisions from their capacity to control outcomes and implement decisions. In his argument, an active society is one that has both capacities. At this conference greater emphasis seemed to be given to the process of reaching consensus on performance criteria. Discussions about the consensus capacity within the states stressed the communication gap between institutions and legislatures and some of the negative stereotypes that each had of the other. The major concern was that educators and legislators find ways to work together more effectively. It was pointed out that the anti-legislative, anti-government bureaucracy attitude in the country may be as strong as the anti-higher education feeling. In any case, the two groups share a common problem -- explaining what their efforts accomplish -- which might be the basis for dialogue. Specific mechanisms for generating dialogue were less clear. Conference participants recognized that legislative decision-making power was often situated outside education committees or staff groups and that the real criteria for policy decisions were often pragmatic and political. Participants also recognized the need to involve state executive agency staff in the dialogue.

In the area of controlling outcomes or implementing decisions, participants noted that the growth of information systems and analytic staff that has already occurred in institutions of higher education is also taking place in the legislative and executive branches. In many states all of these groups may eventually be working in the same area. Because the concerns and purposes of these groups differ, there may be duplication, conflicts, distrust of another group's data and analyses and competition. Since such potential conflicts add to the real costs of higher education control systems, any consideration of the performance approach needs to ask whether it would create additional bureaucratic

procedures or simplify present systems.

Creating Consensus on Performance Criteria

Conference discussion groups identified two quite different approaches to creating consensus on performance criteria for a state considering adopting them. One approach starts with legislative and executive information needs for decision-making as the basis for defining the scope and nature of data required for performance criteria. The other approach assumes that valid information begins with institutional statements of mission, role and scope from which institutions develop their own performance criteria and present them to the state government. Obviously these two approaches represent different styles of state coordination and governance, but they may also represent very different notions of performance indicators. The first focuses on what institutions think they accomplish and the second on the concerns of legislators and executive officials in their daily political lives. Sid Micek's paper explored the different priorities one might find in these two approaches and identified outcomes preferred by various constituencies.

Although there were different opinions about the appropriate role of the state legislatures, state executive officers, higher education coordinating officials and institutions in determining performance criteria, there was general agreement that if institutions or the higher education agencies didn't take the initiative, the states would. There was also agreement that the process through which performance criteria were established should involve open discussion. Reports from states already involved in performance reviews gave some useful if limited information on the experience of establishing performance criteria.

Measurement Issues

As Sid Micek pointed out, the measurement of performance indicators is complicated by a number of issues: the lack of explicit measures for outcomes, misunderstanding or ignorance about techniques for analyzing and collecting

outcome measures, the lack of goals and objectives that indicators might be oriented toward, and fear that performance indicators will be misused. Despite these difficulties, several states are beginning to use outcome or performance criteria in serious attempts to assess programs, and the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) has a major project to categorize outcome criteria.

The conference also highlighted a number of additional issues involved in measuring performance outcomes. One is that the content of each performance criterion needs to be carefully spelled out. What in fact is being measured? Is it an immediate outcome or an impact on the larger society? Can it be measured now or only after the passage of time? The NCHEMS outcomes offered a useful initial categorization of different content areas of outcomes.

Another problem is that the level of measurement arouses considerable debate. Should performance measures be specified for programs or for institutions? Those interested in resource allocation and concerned about current budgetary constraints seemed to favor performance outcomes based on program level assessments. Others who were more concerned about institutional autonomy and about even more abstract and hard-to-measure institutional outcomes seemed to prefer institutional level measures. A survey made last year by Robert Barak showed that most of the existing attempts to develop performance measures by state higher education agencies focus on programs rather than total institutions and this may be the continuing trend.

Regardless of the content of performance criteria or the level on which performance is measured, a major difficulty in using performance indicators is imputing causation from the higher education experience to changes in the outcome indicators. Setting up comparative research programs to control all the variables that might influence the outcomes is extremely time consuming and expensive. One alternative suggested that a longitudinal review of the same performance measures, if used consistently and cautiously, might be an effective barometer.

Along with the difficulty of imputing causation to the performance measures, the problem of deciding what standards to use for evaluation emerges. One approach is to relate performance measures to goals. But this approach may overlook many important unintended consequences of a particular program or institutional effort which could be far more important than the achievement of a predetermined goal. Another method is comparison. With this approach there are difficulties in finding similar institutional types of programs and in insuring consistency in data collection and analysis procedures in larger scale institutional comparisons. This problem of standards has already been identified as a major focus for NCHEMS' institutioral exchange project which, unfortunately, does not currently focus on outcome measures.

A final measurement issue involves the people who review and evaluate performance. Too many reviewers and limited agreement on which criteria are most appropriate lead to the establishment of too many criteria. Further, exaggerated fear of misuse of simplistic indicators may encourage overemphasis on the development of multiple outcome measures. This not only increases the difficulty of performance assessment but also fosters state-level decisionmakers' concerns that they will receive too much data.

The Evaluation Process

Conference discussion groups explored the roles and functions of the various constituencies who participate in the evaluation process. These include institution-based evaluation teams, state higher education agency research staff, state legislators and executive auditing staff, outside accreditation teams, and various combinations of these groups. The functions of the various constituencies are partially related to the purpose of the evaluation -- whether it is to provide information for improvement or to make final judgments on contributions.

The assessment or evaluation issue is further complicated by the questions of who is the best source of data and should it be collected and

provided by the institutions themselves, by state agencies, or by some other group. Conference participants did not reach a consensus about the roles and functions of the various groups in the data analysis and assessment process. Obviously, institutions desire to claim as large a role as possible yet most of the efforts initiated today appear to come from the state level. But as distrust among constituencies increases, these issues become more central to making the assessment process work.

Linking Dilemmas: Relating Outcomes to Action

Conference participants reported little experience in relating performance measures to the budgeting function and suggested that budgets were influenced by very marginal judgments that might be made on the basis of information available from some program review or audit. Most felt that the form of budgeting had little effect on outcomes and that it was not likely to affect the number of dollars received. Thus, there was little support in the discussion groups for attempting to link performance measurement to budgeting. On the positive side, some did feel that performance parameters could help to identify problems and that both qualitative and quantitative performance measures might encourage creation of alternative means for achieving outcomes which then could be tried and evaluated.

Most conference participants supported the development of performance indicators first and only after there is substantial experience with the indicators would they consider moving into performance budgeting. There seemed to be a tendency to stress the development of quantitative performance indicators first and some participants believed that these quantitative indicators might be the only ones that would have any potential use in the budgeting process. There was an even stronger feeling that performance measures should not or could not be related to budgeting at all, first, because budget decisions have to be made annually while performance indicators change slowly,and second, because budget decisions

are based on information which is easily understood while the linkage between outcomes and budget dollars may not be apparent.

Finally, if performance measures were to be applied to the budgetary process, there was concern that there be a close fit between the budgetary reporting structure and an outcome in order to show a cause-and-effect relationship. This was of greater concern to those interested in program-oriented performance measures. A plausible linking structure for institutional performance budgets was less clear except in relation to institutional lump sum appropriations.

Summary and Recommendations

The conference produced no strong agreement on why performance measures were necessary or desirable and no clear evidence of their consequences. There was, especially among state-level officials, general agreement that the adoption of such measures may be inevitable, that they may have desirable consequences, and that there is a need to pursue their development. Participants provided many examples of using performance indicators for program audits or review but had little experience in the area of performance budgeting. There was a strong feeling that performance criteria and performance evaluation processess need to be the focus of much more dialogue among interested parties but that the form of the dialogue will vary from state to state. The participants exhibited great interest and substantial caution. Whether their tentativeness reflected a form of future shock, fear, or suspicions of faddishness is not clear. However, it is clear that while participants were not ready for a "Grand Scheme," they would subscribe to at least some of the recommendations that follow.

1. If outcome or performance reviews are to have a positive effect and if there is any potential for relating them to the budget process, institutional-based innovators, budget officers, and state level officials need a new set of attitudes. Innovators need to avoid the pitfall of having "answers in search of money." Budgeters have to focus on "outcomes and not inputs." Legislators need to convince others that they are willing to "provide incentives"

to give the approach chance to develop. All need to treat this development as a "new experience," as a theory to be tested rather than a "New Dogma" which conflicts with "truth or past experience."

2. It may be useful to establish mechanisms for dialogue among various constituencies on a state-by-state basis. Some suggestions included:
   a. Informal institution/legislator/executive branch staff meetings to discuss issues and problems of higher education and focused around performance measures.
   b. Creation of an independent citizens council to collect and maintain information on the performance of higher education, and
   c. The development of a group uncommitted to any constituency composed of people who understand education, have evaluation experience, have some expertise in public policy assessment, and understand the legislative process. Such a group or task force might guide the development of an effective performance system while allaying some of the fears of each constituency about potential abuses by the others.
3. There is a need to review and evaluate past experience with performance measures and performance review or auditing.
4. There should be continued funding of major development projects like the performance budgeting project in Tennessee supported by a grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education. A set of projects in different states designed to compare the complexity of higher education structures, the variation in coordination mechanisms, and different types of performance criteria might give needed insight into the consequences of performance assessment and the extent to which it could be tied to budgeting.
5. There was support for continued meetings or conferences to explain this topic. These would include meetings of the various constituents in states with active programs, regional meetings of states not yet involved, and the creation of a broadly representative National Task Force to set forth some principles and guidelines.

Final Agenda

An Invitational Seminar on
"INNOVATION, OUTCOMES, AND THE STATE BUDGETING PROCESS"

Hotel del Coronado
San Diego, California
March 22 - 24, 1976

Monday, March 22

1:00 p.m. - Seminar Suite 286 open. Pick up folders and badges here.

5:00 p.m. - Informal reception -- Suite 286

6:30 p.m. - Dinner -- Hanover Room, just off the courtyard.

8:00 p.m. - Welcome and seminar overview -- Kenneth Fischer, Director, Postsecondary Education Convening Authority.

8:30 p.m. - Speakers: John Folger, Director, Project on Evaluation of Planning in Postsecondary Education, Education Commission of the States, and

Sidney S. Micek, Director, Outcomes of Postsecondary Education Project, National Center for Higher Education Management Systems

Topic: "Introducing Outcomes and Performance Concepts into the Budget Process: Implications for Educational Innovation, Change, and Accountability."

9:30 p.m. - Seminar Suite open

Tuesday, March 23

9:00 a.m. - Morning Session -- Stuart Room, just off the courtyard.

Speaker: The Honorable Howard Klebanoff, Chairman House Education Committee, State of Connecticut

Interviews with: Eileen Anderson, Director, State Department of Budget and Finance, State of Hawaii

Howard Bowen, R. Stanton Avery Professor of Economics and Education, Claremont Graduate School, Claremont, California

James Furman, Executive Director, Illinois Board of Higher Education

Interviewer: Fred Pinkham, Consultant, Greenwich, Connecticut.

Topic: "Reform in the State Budgeting Process for Postsecondary Education: Perspectives of the State Executive Branch, the State Higher Education Agency, and the Institutions."

12:00 noon - Agenda-setting for small-group sessions that will focus on problems, issues, and needed actions concerning performance-based budgeting in postsecondary education.

12:30 p.m. - Group Lunch -- Hanover Room

1:30 p.m. - Small-group sessions convene -- Ballroom

Group assignments will be made Tuesday morning to assure balanced representation.

3:30 p.m. - Reconvene total group for small-group progress reports -- Ballroom

4:00 p.m. - Adjourn for the day

Wednesday, March 24

9:00 a.m. - Small groups reconvene -- Ballroom

10:30 a.m. - Total group reconvenes for summary reports by small groups -- Stuart Room

11:30 a.m. - Synthesis of the seminar by Marvin Peterson, Center for the Study of Higher Education, The University of Michigan.

12:00 noon - Where do we go from here?

12:30 p.m. - Adjournment (before lunch)

Check-out time for conferees is 1:30 p.m.

Seminar sponsored by:
Education Commission of the States
National Association of State Budget Officers
Legis 50/ The Center for Legislative Improvement
National Conference of State Legislatures
National Center for Higher Education Management Systems
National Governors' Conference
Institute for Educational Leadership

FINAL LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

SEMINAR ON INNOVATION, OUTCOMES, AND THE STATE BUDGETING PROCESS
San Diego, California
March 22 - 24, 1976

Eileen Anderson
Director
State Department of Budget & Finance
State Capitol
P. O. Box 150
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
808/548-2325

Philip Arnold
Legislative Fiscal Analyst
Wisconsin Legislative Fiscal Bureau
State Capitol
Madison, Wisconsin 53702
608/266-3847

Roger Bassett
Assistant Director for Planning
Planning & Budgeting Division
State Board for Community College Education
319 Seventh Avenue
Olympia, Washington 98504
206/753-3675

Robert Berdahl
Senior Fellow
Carnegie Council on Policy Studies In Higher Education
2150 Shattuck Avenue
Berkeley, California 94704
415/849-4474

Grady Bogue
Director
Performance Funding Project
Tennessee Higher Education Commission
908 Andrew Jackson State Office Building
Nashville, Tennessee 37219
615/741-3605

Howard Bowen
R. Stanton Avery Professor of Economics & Education
Claremont Graduate School
Claremont, California 91711
714/626-8511

James Browne
Coordinator
The Associates Program
Institute for Educational Leadership
1001 Connecticut Avenue, N. W., Suite 310
Washington, D. C. 20036
202/785-4991

Kent Bulloch
Director of Training
National Conference of State Legislatures
Executive Tower, 23rd Floor
1405 Curtis Street
Denver, Colorado 80202
303/623-6600

Gilbert Bursley
State Senator
Michigan State Senate
State Capitol
Lansing, Michigan 48903
517/373-2406

Albert Burstein
Assistant Majority Leader
General Assembly of New Jersey
2033 Lemoine Avenue
Fort Lee, New Jersey 07024
201/653-7500

Patrick Callan
Executive Coordinator
Council for Postsecondary Education
908 East 5th Street
Olympia, Washington 98504
206/753-2210

George C. Connor, Jr.
State Representative
2647 Havana Street
New Orleans, Louisiana 70119
504/947-6397

Ron Corwin
Executive Vice President
SUNY/Empire State College
2 Union Avenue
Saratoga Springs, New York 12866
518/587-2100

Alden Dunham
Program Officer
Carnegie Corporation of New York
437 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10022
212/371-3200

D. Francis Finn
Executive Vice President
National Association of College
and University Business Officers
One Dupont Circle, Suite 510
Washington, D. C. 20036
202/296-2346

Kenneth C. Fischer
Director
Postsecondary Education Convening Authority
Institute for Educational Leadership
1001 Connecticut Avenue, N. W., Suite 310
Washington, D. C. 20036
202/833-2745

John Folger
Director, Project on Evaluation and
Improvement of Planning in Postsecondary
Education
Education Commission of the States
1860 Lincoln Street, Room 300
Denver, Colorado 80302
303/893-5200

Jean E. Ford
Assemblyperson
General Assembly of Nevada
3511 Pueblo Way
Las Vegas, Nevada 89109
702/735-0375

James Furman
Executive Director
Illinois Board of Higher Education
119 South 5th Street
Springfield, Illinois 62701
217/782-3442 ext. 2551

Melvin George
Vice President for Academic Affairs
University of Missouri
309 University Hall
Columbia, Missouri 65201
314/882-6441

Dennis Gooler
Director
Office of Research and Planning
University of Mid-America
P. O. Box 82006
Lincoln, Nebraska 68501
402/467-3671

Samuel Halperin
Director
Institute for Educational Leadership
1001 Connecticut Avenue, N. W., Suite 310
Washington, D. C. 20036
202/833-1737

Fred Harcleroad
Professor of Higher Education
College of Education
University of Arizona
1415 Fremont Street
Tucson, Arizona 85721
602/884-2284

Warren Hill
Project Director
In-Service Education Program
Education Commission of the States
1860 Lincoln Street, 822 Lincoln Tower
Denver, Colorado 80203
303/893-5200

Clyde Ingle
Deputy Assistant
Commissioner for Postsecondary Education
Rhode Island Department of Education
199 Promenade Street
Providence, Rhode Island 02908
401/277-2685

Dennis Jones
Associate Director
National Center for Higher Education
Management Systems at WICHE
P. O. Drawer P
Boulder, Colorado 80302
303/492-8343

John Joplin
Senior Consultant
Arthur Young and Company
2100 The Financial Company
Seattle, Washington 98161
206/623-9000

Howard Klebanoff
Chairman
House Education Committee
410 Asylum Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06103
203/549-6400

Marilyn Kressel
Project Coordinator
Postsecondary Education Convening Authority
Institute for Educational Leadership
1001 Connecticut Avenue, N. W., Suite 310
Washington, D. C. 20036
202/833-2745

Daniel M. Martin
President
Associated Colleges of the Midwest
60 West Walton Street
Chicago, Illinois 60610
312/664-9580

Dan Marvin
Director
State Council on Higher Education
for Virginia
700 Fidelity Building
9th and Main Streets
Richmond, Virginia 23219
804/786-2143

Sidney Micek
Director
Outcomes of Postsecondary Education Project
National Center for Higher Education
Management Systems at WICHE
P. O. Drawer P
Boulder, Colorado 80302
303/492-8292

Richard Millard
Director
Higher Education Services
Education Commission of the States
1860 Lincoln Street, Suite 300
Denver, Colorado 80203
303/893-5200

Frank Nassetta
Deputy Administrator
National Center for Educational Statistics
400 Maryland Avenue, S. W.
Washington, D. C. 20202
202/245-8703

Adelaide O'Brien
Administrative Assistant to
Chairman, Senate Education Committee
328 State Capitol
St. Paul, Minnesota 55155
612/296-4185

Melvin Orwig
Associate Director
National Center for Higher Education
Management Systems at WICHE
P. O. Drawer P
Boulder, Colorado 80302
303/492-7492

Dale Parnell
Chancellor
San Diego Community College District
3375 Camino del Rio South
San Diego, California 92108
714/280-7610

Marvin W. Peterson
Associate Professor of Higher Education
and Faculty Associate
The University of Michigan
The Center for the Study of Higher
Education
School of Education
2007 S. E. B.
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104
313/764-9472

Fred Pinkham
Assistant Administrator
Bureau for Population and
Humanitarian Assistance
Agency for International Development
U. S. Department of State
Room 3932
Washington, D. C. 20523
202/632-8558

Frank Schmidtlein
Research Specialist
Center for Research and Development
in Higher Education
University of California
2150 Shattuck Avenue
Berkeley, California 94704
415/642-7450

Melinda Smart
Secretary
Postsecondary Education Convening Authority
Institute for Educational Leadership
1001 Connecticut Avenue, N. W., Suite 310
Washington, D. C. 20036
202/833-2745

Donald Smith
Senior Vice President
Academic Affairs
University of Wisconsin System Office
Madison, Wisconsin 53706
608/262-6420

Donald Walters
Executive Officer
The Board of Governors
State College and University System
222 College Street
Springfield, Illinois 62706
217/782-6392

James Wead
Special Assistant
The Council of State Governments
Iron Works Pike - P. O. Box 11910
Lexington, Kentucky 40511
606/252-2291

George Weathersby
Professor
Harvard University
450 Guttman Library
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
617/495-3447

Stephen Weiner
Assistant Professor
School of Education
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305
415/497-3586

Invited But Unable to Attend

Linda Alcorn Adams
Director
Economic and Fiscal Commission
Room 610, State Office Building
Springfield, Illinois 62706
217/782-5320

Philip Austin
Deputy Assistant Secretary for
Education Policy Development
Room 3153, FOB-6
400 Maryland Avenue, S. W.
Washington, D. C. 20202
202/245-7916

R. Kenneth Barnes
Secretary
Department of Budget and Fiscal Planning
State House
Annapolis, Maryland 21404
301/278-0100

Edwin Beach
Assistant Director
California Department of Finance
Room 1145 - State Capitol
Sacramento, California 95814
916/445-8582

George Bell
Executive Director
National Association of State Budget Officers
Iron Works Pike - P. O. Box 11910
Lexington, Kentucky 40511
606/252-2291

John Bragg
State Representative
320 South Church
Murfreesboro, Tennessee 37130
615/741-3818

David Breneman
Senior Fellow in Economic Studies
Brookings Institution
1775 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036
202/797-6133

Richard Brown
Post Auditor
Mills Building, 9th and Kansas Avenue
State House
Topeka, Kansas 66612
913/296-3792

Richard H. Bryan
State Senator
Suite 710, 225 East Bridger Street
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
702/885-5000

Norman Burns
Director Emeritus
Commission on Higher Education
Institutions
North Central Association
10 Crest Drive
Dune Acres
Chesterton, Indiana 46304
219/787-8319

Benjamin L. Cardin
Delegate
211 Saint Paul Place
Baltimore, Maryland 21202
301/267-0100

Dale Cattanach
Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau
Room 107, South
State Capitol
Madison, Wsiconsin 53702
608/266-3847

Ray Chamberlain
President
Colorado State University
Fort Collins, Colorado 80521
303/291-6211

William Chance
Deputy Coordinator
Policies and Planning
Council for Postsecondary Education
908 East 5th Street
Olympia, Washington 98504
206/753-2210

Bert Chaney
State Senator
915 East 13th Street
Hutchinson, Kansas 67501
913/296-0111

Arthur Chickering
Vice President, Policy Analysis
SUNY/Empire State College
2 Union Avenue
Saratoga Springs, New York 12866
518/587-2100

Anson Chong
Chairman, Health Committee
State Senate
Box 813
Honolulu, Hawaii 96808
808/548-2211

Nicholas Coleman
State Senator
State Capitol, Room 208
St. Paul, Minnesota 55155
612/296-4196

John Corlew
State Senator
Box 787
Pascagoula, Mississippi 39567
601/948-7321

Fred Crossland
Program Officer
Higher Education and Research
The Ford Foundation
320 East 43rd Street
New York, New York 10017
212/573-5031

Sharon Coldren
Policy Analysis Service
American Council on Education
One Dupont Circle, N. W., Suite 800
Washington, D. C. 20036
202/833-4700

Peter de Janosi
Program Officer
The Ford Foundation
320 East 43rd Street
New York, New York 10017
212/573-5037

David DiCarlo
State Representative
11881 Robison Road
Erie, Pennsylvania 16509
717/783-2036

Ralph Dungan
Chancellor
New Jersey Department of Higher Education
225 West State Street
Trenton, New Jersey 08625
609/292-4310

Russell Edgerton
Deputy Director
Fund for the Improvement of
Postsecondary Education
Room 3139, FOB-6
400 Maryland Avenue, S. W.
Washington, D. C. 20202
202/245-8101

Peter Ellis
Program Director
Kellogg Foundation
400 North Avenue
Battle Creek, Michigan 49016
616/965-1221

Stephen Farber
Executive Director
National Governors' Conference
1150 17th Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036
202/785-5600

James Flynn
State Senator
1432 South 86th Street
West Allis, Wisconsin 53214
608/266-2211

Robert Gale
President
Association of Governing Boards
One Dupont Circle, Suite 720
Washington, D. C. 20036
202/296-8300

Lyman Glenny
Director
Center for Research and Development
in Higher Education
University of California
2150 Shattuck Avenue
Berkeley, California 94704
415/642-7509

Robert Graham
State Senator
The Florida Senate
14420 N. W. 60th Avenue
Miami Lakes, Florida 33014
305/558-8071

Leroy Greene
Assemblyman
5738 Marconi Avenue
Carmichael, California 95609
916/445-7807

Joseph Harder
State Senator
Senate Chambers
State House
Topeka, Kansas 66612
913/296-2497

Lee Henderson
Director
Division of Community Colleges
Department of Education
310 Collins Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
904/488-1721

Richard S. Hodes
State Representative
238 East Davis Boulevard, Suite H
Tampa, Florida 33606
813/251-3421

Harold Hodgkinson
Director
National Institute of Education
Room 722, Brown Building
1200 19th Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20208
202/254-5740

James Holderman
Vice President for Education
Lilly Endowment, Inc.
2801 North Meridian Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46208
317/924-5471

T. Edward Hollander
Deputy Commissioner for Higher
and Professional Education
99 Washington Avenue
Albany, New York 12230
518/474-5851

Steny Hoyer
State Senator
6108 Old Silver Hill Road
District Heights, Maryland 20028
301/267-0100

Thomas Hynes
State Senator
10540 South Western
Chicago, Illinois 60643
217/782-5500

James Johnson
Former Executive Director
National Governors' Conference
1150 17th Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036
202/785-5600

Stephen Kafoury
State Representative
#4, 1905 N. E. 16th
Portland, Oregon 97212
503/378-8074

Sheldon Knorr
Director
Maryland Commission on Higher Education
93 Main Street
Annapolis, Maryland 21401
301/267-0100

Joseph Kyle
Legislative Fiscal Officer
State Capitol
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804
504/389-2657

Edward Lane
State Representative
State House
Richmond, Virginia 23219
804/786-8321

Joseph Lieberman
State Senator
69 Colony Road
New Haven, Connecticut 06511
203/566-2211

Larry Marshall
State Senator
1009 Bob-O-Link
Columbia, Missouri 65201
314/751-4650

Richard Marvel
State Senator
Nebraska State Senate
1249 North Lexington, Box 984
Hastings, Nebraska 68901
402/471-2311

Lucille Maurer
Delegate
Maryland General Assembly
House of Delegates
1023 Forest Glen Road
Silver Spring, Maryland 20901
301/593-4661

Oscar Mauzy
State Senator
Box 47972
Dallas, Texas 75247
512/475-2528

Marvin McKee
State Representative
Box 26
Guymon, Oklahoma 73942
405/521-2711

Donald McNeil
Executive Director
California Postsecondary Education Commission
1020 12th Street
Sacramento, California 95814
916/445-7933

Elton McQuery
Assistant Executive Director
Legis 50/The Center for Legislative Improvement
7503 Marin Drive, Suite 2A
Englewood, Colorado 80110
800/525-9330

Edgar Mouton, Jr.
State Senator
Drawer Z
Lafayette, Louisiana 70501
504/389-5061

Jon Newton
State Representative
301 East Huntington
Beeville, Texas 78102
512/475-5943

Kenneth O'Brien
Associate Director
California Postsecondary Education Commission
1020 12th Street
Sacramento, California 98514
916/445-1001

Arthur Palmer
Director
Nevada Legislative Council Bureau
Legislative Building
Carson City, Nevada 89701
702/885-5627

John Patton
Director of Intergovernmental Affairs
Office of the Secretary
Department of Transportation
Room 10406
Washington, D. C. 20599
202/426-1525

Donald Percy
Senior Vice President for Administration
University of Wisconsin System
Madison, Wisconsin 57306
608/262-9701

Ray Pethtel
Director
Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission
823 East Main Street, Suite 200
Richmond, Virginia 23219
804/786-1258

William Pound
Director of State Services
National Conference of State Legislatures
Executive Tower, 23rd Floor
1405 Curtis Street
Denver, Colorado 80202
303/623-6600

Graham Richard
State Senator
2523 Merrivale
Fort Wayne, Indiana 46805
219/484-5332

Alan Rosenthal
Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics
The Rutgers University
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901
201/828-2210

Kathy Sample
Research Assistant
National Conference of State Legislatures
Executive Tower, 23rd Floor
1405 Curtis Street
Denver, Colorado 80202
303/623-6600

Gordon Sandison
Chairman
Senate Committee on Higher Education
P. O. Box 2025
Port Angeles, Washington 98362
206/753-7646

Howard Smith
Chairman
Appropriations for Higher Education
116 West Main Street
Crosby, Minnesota 56441
612/296-4874

Morgan Smith
State Representative
275 South 6th Avenue
Brighton, Colorado 80601
303/892-9911

Virginia Smith
Director
Fund for the Improvement of
Postsecondary Education
Room 2129, FOB-6
400 Maryland Avenue, S. W.
Washington, D. C. 20202
202/245-8091

Jerrold Speers
State Senator
Winthrop, Maine 04364
207/289-3386

Joseph Stewart
Deputy Director
Department of Finance and Administration
State Capitol
Little Rock, Arkansas 72203
201/371-2242

Clinton Tanimura
Legislative Auditor
Room 8, State Capitol Building
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
808/548-2450

James Townsend
State Representative
Route 6, Box 159
Shawnee, Oklahome 74801
405/521-2011

John Vasconcellos
Assemblyman
4320 Stevens Creek Boulevard
San Jose, California 95129
916/445-4253

Harry Wiggins
State Senator
7520 Main Street
Kansas City, Missouri 64114
314/751-2788

Stephen Wiley
State Senator
250 Madison Avenue
Morristown, New Jersey 07960
201/539-7553

Don Williamson
State Senator
Drawer 432
Vivian, Louisiana 71082
318/221-2167

Terry Willkom
Assemblyman
Route 1, Box 20A
Chippewa Falls, Wisconsin 54729
608/266-2401

Richard Wong
State Senator
728 Twin View Drive
Honolulu, Hawaii 96817
808/548-2211

Norman Yamamura
State Department of Budget and Finance
State Capitol
P. O. Box 150
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
808/548-2211

Kenneth Young
President
The Council on Postsecondary Accreditation
One Dupont Circle, Suite 760
Washington, D. C. 20036
202/452-1433

INSTITUTE FOR
EDUCATIONAL
LEADERSHIP

THE
GEORGE
WASHINGTON
UNIVERSITY

Suite 310
1001 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Samuel Halperin
Director
(202) 833-1737

•

Washington Internships in Education
(202) 223-3415

Educational Staff Seminar
(202) 293-3166

The Associates Program
(202) 785-4991

Leadership Training Institute
(202) 833-9051

Postsecondary Education Convening Authority
(202) 833-2745

"Options on Education" over National Public Radio
(202) 833-9178

INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION CONVENING AUTHORITY

STATE GOVERNMENTS AS FUNDERS OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION: CATALYSTS FOR IMPROVEMENT?

Report of the San Francisco Conference

"State Funding of Postsecondary Education:
Incentives for Improvement"

July 17 - 19, 1975
Clift Hotel
San Francisco, California

INTRODUCTION

Pressures continue to mount on postsecondary institutions to improve the cost-effectiveness of their programs. Within the Federal government, agencies such as the National Institute of Education and the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education are attempting to help institutions respond to these pressures by funding research and action projects. But the source of most of the financing and regulatory policies and practices which most directly affect postsecondary institutions are in each of the fifty states. Without state support, few lasting improvements can be made; with state support, much can be done.

Most recent state efforts to produce change within postsecondary institutions have involved negative actions. State governments have denied a variety of institutional requests (e.g., budget increases, approval of new programs), have regulated the conduct of faculty and administrators (e.g., affirmative action, faculty contact hours, detailed expenditure controls), and have evaluated performance (e.g., audits, program reviews). These kinds of actions are often necessary, but rarely are they sufficient to bring about lasting, constructive change. Actions are now needed which provide positive inducements to change and support those who are trying to put improvements into place.

So it seemed, at least, to the educators, state legislators, state budget officers, state agency officials, and other interested citizens who gathered at the Clift Hotel in San Francisco, July 17 - 19, to explore what new initiatives state governments might take to catalyze improvments in postsecondary educational institutions. The meeting began with a presentation by Dr. Clark Kerr, chairman of the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. Beginning on a rather discouraging note, Dr. Kerr pointed out that, historically, improvement in higher education has come in periods of growth -- yet now we are heading in to retrenchment. He went on to stress the need for aggressive leadership, for funds earmarked exclusively for improvement activities, and for state formulas which facilitate rather than thwart improvement efforts. His parting words were pointed:

> "So I say to those of you in state government, that while the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education and other Federal programs will continue to contribute to improvements, the actions taken by the fifty states will increasingly decide whether or not higher education remains as dynamic as the American nation needs and deserves."

At "Grand Rounds" the following day, the leaders of five innovative postsecondary institutions -- the Community College of Vermont, College IV with the Grand Valley State Colleges in Michigan, Empire State College in New York, the Regional Learning Service in New York, and the Serviceman's Opportunity College (administered in Washington, D. C.) -- described various difficulties and issues which had arisen in their dealings with state governments. The major theme was that some state practices -- e.g., allocating funds according to credit-hour driven formulas, student admissions, quotas, and residency requirements -- acted as inhibitors and disincentives to those attempting to introduce cost-effective reforms in postsecondary education.

The issues, from the perspective of state policymakers, were defined by a panel consisting of Edwin Beach, Assistant Director, California Department of Finance; John Folger, Education Commission of the States; and Robert Graham, state senator from Florida.

Following this panel presentation, everyone joined one of four working groups, each of which was charged with the task of exploring proposals for new state initiatives. As background for these discussions, participants were given two papers which had been prepared in advance of the meeting. Richard Meeth's Government Funding Policies and Nontraditional Programs identified the nature and extent of existing disincentives to the emergence of innovative, time-free and place-free educational programs inherent in state funding formulas, guidelines, and regulations. Martin Finkelstein's The Incentive Grant Approach in Higher Education: A 15-Year Record, chronicled the 55 incentive grant programs that are, or have been, administered by state agencies and multi-campus systems in the past fifteen years. Working group leaders reported on these discussions at a final wrap-up session.

This report does not summarize presentations and discussions which took place in San Francisco. Rather, it represents a statement growing out of the meeting intended to define or promote the state role in catalyzing improvement in postsecondary education. The report looks back upon the gathering in the light of three questions:

1. How did the participants feel about the need for improvement and the prospects for state action?

2. Improvement toward what? What priorities did the participants seem most interested in having states pursue?

3. What suggestions were made as to how the states might pursue these priorities?

A final section describes events which have taken place since July, 1975, which represent efforts to move forward on some of the ideas the report describes.

I. SOBERING PROSPECTS FOR POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

The people gathered at the Clift Hotel were keenly aware of the new, tough social-political realities facing postsecondary institutions. Talk was blunt. Senator Robert Graham captured the feelings of most of those present in summing up five "threatening prospects" for the future:

-- Danger of stagnation. Institutions could easily lose their vitality and capacity for change. Clark Kerr's opening remarks indicated some of the reasons why. More than half of all the faculty now teaching were hired in the 1960's, and won't be retiring until the year 2,000. Fifty-five percent of all university buildings were constructed in the 1960's, and won't outlive their usefulness until the year 2,000. Many institutions are caught with high percentages -- up to 90% -- of tenured faculty. Unionism is growing. While the prospects for change in the year 2,000 are enormous, what do we do from now to then?

-- Restraints on change. The reward system within postsecondary education often militates against practices which respond to the real needs and interests of constituents. The environment is becoming increasingly complex. Regulation is increasing.

-- Increasing competition for scarce resources. Industry and mass transit are aggressively competing with education for scarce resources needed for capital improvements.

-- Education - a sinking priority. In terms of allocating available funds, health programs for the aged, and other issues are ranked higher in the hierarchy of problems people care about solving. Also, while state funding in some areas is "uncontrollable," except for changing basic authorization statutes, legislatures vote each year, or each biennium, on education appropriations, and thus, can register their will more readily.

-- The "Brown-Dukakis ethos." People are reevaluating how much government can effectively contribute to their well-being, and withdrawing their support of some government services. The kind of questioning about the value of postsecondary education which Governors Jerry Brown and Michael Dukakis have legitimated is not idiosyncratic. It is a portent of things to come, and must be taken seriously.

These prospects, while sobering, did not mean we should give up hope for creative social or institutional responses, or assume that constructive change couldn't be initiated. Robert Graham pointed out that some educational territory -- such as services to adults -- had not been completely staked out by established interests, and offered plenty of opportunity for choices. Virginia Smith noted that while change often occurs in a time of growth, the kind of change that occurs is often a mere expansion and extension of existing practices. Genuine innovations and quality improvements usually occur in times of retrenchment, when assumptions are questioned and tough decisions must be made.

II. PRIORITIES FOR STATE ACTION

Much of the conversation was focused on the "how" questions concerning the role of state governments in stimulating improvements. But, repeatedly the question arose: What kinds of priorities could states realistically pursue? Four answers predominated in the presentations and comments of the participants.

1. Focus on performance

Retrenchment and competition stimulate the question: How do we tell whether a given institution is doing a good job? If we cannot simply maintain all institutions and programs but must choose among them on the basis of relative merit, what constitutes effective performance? And this question raises the more fundamental issue: What is it that postsecondary institutions are supposed to be achieving? For what can we hold them accountable?

Many present responded very positively to the theme of focusing on performance. Senator Graham observed that "states should focus on objectives rather than the processes of change, since there is no necessary correlation between social

needs and educational productivity." Goals needed to be clarified. While the growing movement to define educational outcomes in terms of the kinds of knowledge, skills, and attitudes students should be able to demonstrate upon graduation was noted, participants observed that this movement was not clearly understood nor practiced by many institutions.

Others noted that measures of quality and outcomes were not entirely foreign to postsecondary education. But previous criteria, which often focused on the nature and content of educational offerings, do not seem as useful now. Consumers of all kinds want criteria more appropriate to the 70's and 80's.

2. Preserving the adaptability of postsecondary institutions

Confronting postsecondary institutions are new kinds of students, substantial changes in the labor market, new demands for economy, and other conditions which require substantial changes in their programs and methods of doing business. They must not only adapt to present realities, but also preserve the capacity to adapt to unanticipated requirements in the future.

Presenters and participants identified changes both internal and external to the institutions themselves which were threatening institutions' capacity to change. The key internal change was clearly seen as the one identified by Dr. Clark Kerr: the growing number of institutions with built-in faculties who would not retire for a number of years. The educators who made presentations at "grand rounds" identified a number of external changes, including the growth of reporting requirements, budget controls, and regulatory activities--all well-intentioned, but in total a force strangling the flexibility institutions need to manage their own internal affairs productively.

3. Cooperation, and the more effective use of educational resources

There were a number of calls -- often blunt -- for cooperation and more effective use of educational resources. Several discussants pointed to the need for administrators and faculty members within colleges and universities to see themselves as part of a larger system of human services, and to link their efforts with other agencies concerned with human development. Laurence Hall noted that were educational institutions to do so they might be eligible for new sources of financing -- such as Title 20 funds under social services.

Edwin Beach challenged the "educational establishment" to recognize the important resources for education represented by the trade and technical schools, proprietary institutions, industrial programs, and other institutions offering non-degree-granting courses. He proposed moving out of the traditional mode of funding education, to specify what services states expect to be delivered to their citizens, and then to contract with whatever institutions can most effectively provide these.

While the need for cooperation and integration elicited universal agreement, conferees differed sharply on issues about how this objective could be pursued most effectively. Some felt that confrontation was more appropriate than talk of incentives and compromise. Voluntary cooperation would never occur or work

even if it were accepted. Others argued that effective cooperation among institutions requires a combination of institutional self-interest, coordinating authority, involvement of all parties concerned, and incentive funding. This led to the fourth priority for state action -- the need for more trust and rationality in the processes of policymaking.

4. More trust, more rationality

John Folger observed that there were three alternative ways in which decisions concerning educational resources could be made: 1) the free market mechanism, which he stated neither fosters nor inhibits innovation but is neutral; 2) the political mechanism (especially legislative decisionmaking), which is frequently dominated by vested interest groups and is therefore biased toward the status quo; and 3) rational planning -- especially by executive agencies -- which has the potential for stimulating change. Folger observed that the agencies which could provide leadership in planning had not done so, but noted that initiatives (such as the attempt to define performance criteria) had the potential for bringing about substantial improvement.

Richard Millard pleaded for a moratorium on "either-or thinking." It is not true, argued Millard, that improvements are the sole prerogative of either traditional or nontraditional institutions; that change can be most effectively brought about by either legislative bodies or executive agencies; that the instruments of change are either incentives or regulatory approaches. Rather, through national coordination, various groups must be brought together in ways which will ameliorate problems rather than polarize issues.

Senator Robert Graham also stressed the need for establishing a high level of trust among educational administrators and public officials. He noted that one of the most important roles agencies such as the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education could play would be to foster new trust relationships between the internal managers of institutions and the external forces of state governments.

III. PROPOSED INITIATIVES

1. Relax adherence to rigid allocation formulas

Richard Meeth's paper, which reported the views of 134 postsecondary institutions, demonstrated that rigid adherence to allocation formulas for distributing state funds was impeding the development of nontraditional and more cost-effective educational programs. A good part of the discussion of this issue turned on the different views of the participants about the validity of this proposition.

During "Grand Rounds," College IV of the Grand Valley State Colleges illustrated how the allocation formula used in Michigan impeded the efforts of College IV. The Michigan formula is based on the credit hour. Institutions are required to count the students who are in class on the tenth day of the semester, and multiply this by the number of credits the class is worth. But at College IV, the working adults who constitute most of the student population may start whenever they wish, stop and start again. The curriculum has been packaged in small units so that students may earn credits and even fractions of credit for as little as ten hours of study. Classes are held in high schools, shopping

centers, and local industrial plants. Thus, College IV must devise surrogate and sometimes artificial ways to report credit hours, and often is penalized in competition with traditional programs. Also, students at College IV are classified as "continuing education" students if their rate of progress is slower than that of full-time students. Thus, even young students are denied financial aid opportunities because they are pursuing a self-paced, work-study education.

Edwin Beach and Lyman Glenny maintained, in contrast, that states were moving away from rigid adherence to criteria such as the credit-hour and full-time equivalent faculty. They felt that more and more states were becoming increasingly flexible and responsive to the real requirements and needs of institutions. Others pointed out that budget formulas may appear to academicians inside institutions as greater impediments to change than they really are. Cases were cited in which good will and negotiation proved to be reasonable substitutes to the more complex task of devising technical solutions to the problems formulas posed.

While participants disagreed about the extent to which rigid formulas were a problem all agreed that states should not rigidly adhere to formulas, especially those tied to enrollment-driven criteria, such as credit hours which are more appropriate to an era of growth than to an era of retrenchment.

2. Recognize performance in allocating funds

Putting aside the issue of how strictly states adhere to allocation formulas, participants went on to note that the formulas themselves are flawed. They are tied to indicators, such as student-faculty ratios, of the resources used in the educational process. These indicators tell us something about the activities institutions engage in, and what level of effort they expend upon these activities. But they tell us nothing about the relationship between these activities and the results of education.

A second proposal put forward during the gathering was, therefore, that state governments should recognize and reward institutional performance in the award of state funds. This was seen as a two-stage process. First, states needed to settle on what it was they thought institutions should achieve, and how these achievements could be measured. Several participants noted that states and consumer groups were particularly interested in measures of productivity: Are graduates getting jobs for which they were prepared? Were they, after graduation, satisfied with their educational experiences?

Defining criteria for performance would pave the way for the next step -- allocating state funds on the basis of institutional progress in meeting these criteria. The enormity of the task, and the compelling need to attempt it, were evident to all. Most thought that states could begin, experimentally, by identifying a portion of the total educational budget which would be allocated to institutions on the basis of the new criteria. Grady Bogue of the Tennessee Commission on Higher Education reported that the Commission was working on a project, conceived by John Folger, to do just this -- to identify, with maximum institutional participation, criteria of instructional performance and then to allocate a portion of the state budget according to these criteria.

3. Find ways to finance "unbundled" educational services

Given the numbers of adults interested in further postsecondary opportunities, the inadequacies of existing institutional arrangements for serving them and the uncertainty in many capitals about how much public support adults should receive, everyone seemed to agree that adult education was a "ripe" area for intelligent state policymaking. As to what the elements of state policy might be, several propositions were advanced: 1) The problem was to create out of the educational resources which already exist, such as colleges, libraries, and museums, a coordinated "system" which would work for adults; 2) To create this system, adults needed access in convenient locations to particular educational services, e.g., information and personal counseling; and 3) At the present time most of the essential services -- counseling, advising, teaching, examining student progress, awarding degrees, placement -- are bundled together and offered by one provider, the large college or university "downtown" or (more typically) "out in the suburbs."

During "Grand Rounds," the Regional Learning Service of New York discussed itself as an example of a brokering agency offering a cost-effective particular service to adults. R.L.S. consists of a modest administrative office and a network of 23 part-time "learning consultants" who live and work in five counties. These learning consultants (who need not possess formal credentials for counseling and guidance) provide a crucial service, more effectively, at a lower cost, than many campus-based student services programs. But R.L.S. is not eligible for the state or federal funds which flow to traditional postsecondary institutions. Similarly, clients of R.L.S. services are not eligible for state or federal student aid programs.

Proposals were made for states to find ways of financing needed services not now provided. Some felt that states could open up existing programs to agencies operating outside established institutions. Others saw the states taking a more directive role. The coordinating board in Colorado was cited as an agency which had established a new educational service which coordinates continuing education programs in a number of state universities and colleges, and returns funds raised by tuition to develop further programs throughout the state. Others proposed that states should develop contractual arrangements with proprietary schools, non-degree program scholarship services, and other agencies. Some thought that the states rather than the educational institutions and agencies should specify what outcomes are important, and contract with any agencies which can perform these services.

4. Re-examine state requirements pertaining to residency, admissions, and out-of-state tuition

Also during "Grand Rounds," the Servicemen's Opportunity College presented the dilemmas which confront active-duty servicemen in obtaining degrees from postsecondary institutions. Because servicemen are seldom in one location long enough to meet all the degree and residency requirements of a single institution, they confront, and illustrate, the problems of the transient student: residency requirements, admission quotas, tuition differentials, poor articulation between institutions, problems of transferring credits.

Discussants did not get to the point of prescribing specific strategies and techniques for reducing some of the inter-state disincentives to more effective cooperation and coordination among educational institutions. But all seemed impressed with the importance of the problem and benefits to be gained from addressing it. A major -- perhaps the major -- way to more effective utilization of educational resources would be to enable students to save hours, semesters, and years of time now spent "starting over again" and duplicating work undertaken elsewhere. Educational institutions themselves can remove some barriers which now exist, but others are rooted in state laws and administrative rules.

5. Profit-sharing

Several people proposed that states should experiment with incentives which enable institutions or units within institutions (e.g., departments) to share and profit from their own efforts at being efficient and effective. As the Carnegie Commission's The More Effective Use of Resources points out, private industry has developed a number of profit-sharing schemes whereby innovations that achieve savings reward the innovators. Such incentives do not exist in postsecondary education -- indeed the reverse is true.

Under typical budget procedures, funds unspent by the end of the year revert to the central administration and, under many state budget requirements, to the state treasury. One simple incentive for economizing would be to allow departments and schools to carry over unspent balances from year to year, instead of rushing into expenditures which are not required at the moment. Other, more ambitious schemes, were also suggested. Why can't departments and schools propose strategies and projects for achieving economies and be allowed to retain part of the savings for other things they want to do? Why can't budget choices be decentralized, with incentives built in at each level for sharing the profits of cost savings?

6. Special funds to stimulate improvements and finance developmental costs.

Clark Kerr suggested in his opening remarks that states set aside special funds to do the kind of things within states which the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education has been doing at the national level. In discussing this proposal, many alternatives were suggested ranging from giving each institution percentage set-asides for development, to creating foundations administered by multi-campus systems and state agencies, to establishing councils which would be governed by educators and public interest representatives. The suggestion was made that federal agencies such as the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education could match state efforts to develop incentive grant programs.

There was general agreement that if incentive grant programs do not deal with major problems they are not desirable or politically feasible. Most discussants felt that states must first determine what the problems and objectives for improvement were before determining whether or not an incentive grant program could effectively stimulate solutions. Once the problems were identified, the locus of authority for the incentive grant program could also be determined. Campus-level programs, for example, might best accomplish the objective of stimulating faculty interest in teaching improvements, but state-administered incentive grant programs might best encourage inter-institutional cooperation.

Discussants also cautioned against expecting too much from incentive grant approaches. Faculties and administrators would be likely to proceed incrementally, while legislators would expect more rapid responses to critical problems. Discretionary programs are vulnerable in tight budget years. The smaller the state, the more personal the political processes are likely to be, and the harder it becomes to establish and maintain a program which is selective rather than even-handed in awarding funds.

IV. WHO DOES WHAT?

Toward the end of the session, discussion turned to the more pragmatic issues of who does what. Some objected to the assumption that incentives would produce major changes, and proposed that the 1202 Commission and state coordinating agencies take the initiative. Others pointed out that these boards and agencies were not representative of the widest possible groups, and that they often represented institutional interests rather than consumer interests. Lewis Butler observed that if the postsecondary institutions themselves cannot change and if coordinating boards were ineffective, three alternatives still remain: The executive branches of state government can step in via the budget and other processes; legislatures can create study commissions and special task forces; and citizen advisory groups can create grass-roots support for certain kinds of changes. The gathering ended with expressions of the need to build on this meeting by moving forward in specific areas.

FOLLOW-UP

The planners of the San Francisco conference introduced state policymakers to a range of improvement efforts in postsecondary education in order to identify and analyze the problems facing these innovations and the problems brought about by various state funding policies and reporting requirements. Another objective of the conference was to establish linkages between PECA and the state leadership organizations whose constituents were represented. PECA felt that follow-up activites would be considerably strengthened if organizations, such as the National Governors' Conference (NGC), Legis 50/The Center for Legislative Improvement, the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL), and the National Association of State Budget Officers (NASBO) were involved as cooperating organizations. San Francisco has effectively generated a continuous strengthening between PECA and the leadership of these key organizations which have demonstrated an increasing interest in postsecondary education concerns.

Two PECA papers distributed at the San Francisco conference, L. Richard Meeth's Government Funding Policies and Nontraditional Programs and Martin Finkelstein's The Incentive Grant Approach in Higher Education: A 15-Year Record have received attention in the higher education media. The Chronicle of Higher Education published articles on both the Meeth (7/7/75) and Finkelstein (2/2/76) reports, and the Higher Education Daily summarized the Finkelstein report (1/9/76). Requests for these publications continue to come into PECA on a regular basis. Nearly 4000 copies have been distributed.

Another outcome of the San Francisco Conference was a seminar co-sponsored by ECS's Inservice Education Program and NASBO on "State Budgeting and the Financing of Postsecondary Education" held December 16 - 17, 1975, in Denver. This seminar

marked the first time that these two groups had jointly developed a conference for their constituents. Warren Hill, Director of IEP, credited the San Francisco conference as the catalyst for the ECS/NASBO meeting.

The invitational seminar, "Innovation, Outcomes and the State Budgeting Process," which was held March 22 - 24, 1976 at the Hotel del Coronado, San Diego, California, examined the experience of states which have attempted to identify performance indicators and outcome measures for postsecondary education, and in using such factors in the state budgeting process. Attending the seminar were many key legislators, budget officers, institutional representatives and federal officials. The co-sponsoring organizations, which played an active role in building the invitation list and in planning the meeting, included the Education Commission of the States, the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, the National Conference of State Legislatures, Legis 50/The Center for Legislative Improvement, and the National Governors' Conference.

The synthesis of the San Diego seminar, prepared by Marvin W. Peterson, Associate Professor, Center for Study of Higher Education, University of Michigan, candidly reflects the diversity of opinion and perspectives surrounding the issue of funding of postsecondary education. Most important, however, is that out of San Diego came a commitment by all the groups involved to continue these efforts to increase communication and share the experience of pioneering innovation in the budget process. Among the proposals for further activity are 1) several regional workshops which will bring together representatives from those states with experience in innovative budget techniques to share information with officials from states lacking experience, 2) a second national seminar in late 1976 which will accomodate many of the state officials who were invited to attend the San Diego seminar but were unable to do so because of legislative sessions. The seminar should also benefit from some significant research efforts presently underway. PECA plans to continue to perpetuate the communication which will make these efforts possible.

EDUCATION POLICY FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM (EPFP)

(formerly Washington Internships in Education) is a national program designed to help provide future leaders the skills in policy-making they must have to exert effective and enlightened leadership in American education. Funds for the program are provided by the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations.

Since 1965, the program has placed over 250 mid-career persons in one-year internships in public and private agencies involved in educational policy matters. Carefully recruited sponsors, who are themselves key actors in public policy issues, agree to serve as on-the-job mentors by demonstrating, through their daily tasks, how educational policy is shaped at the State or national level. An important ingredient of the program is the informal weekly seminars through which Fellows interact with decision-makers, eminent authorities and leading specialists in education-related fields. National meetings of Fellows with other special groups contribute further to their understanding of educational policy-making. Fellows' salaries are paid by the sponsoring organizations, while the costs of recruitment, placement and continuing professional development are borne by the EPF Program. Headquartered in Washington with sites in four States, the EPF Program is designed for mid-career persons 25-45 years of age who have completed their academic training. Two-thirds of the forty-five participants in 1975-76 have completed the doctorate degree; all have demonstrated substantial leadership skills and a strong commitment to improving the educational system.

Although EPFP participants are widely considered to be prime candidates for excellent post-Fellowship positions, the EPF Program does not commit itself to obtaining future employment for them. Fellows frequently take leaves of absence from their pre-Fellowship position to participate in the program.

Illinois Coordinator—Robert Bunnell
Massachusetts Coordinator—Ursula Wagener
Michigan Coordinators—Carl Candoli & Matthew Prophet

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR (ESS)

is a professional development program designed for staff members employed by the Executive and Legislative branches of the Federal Government in the field of education. The goals of ESS are to provide an open forum in which participants can improve their professional capabilities and personal fulfillment on the job by:

a) being exposed to new ideas and perspectives;
b) increasing their knowledge of particular subjects and their understanding of how things actually operate in the field, and
c) meeting with other professionals involved in the legislative and policy formulation processes in an informal learning environment which fosters improved professional relationships.

ESS supplements the Washington work experience with a variety of in-service training seminars and in-the-field observation. It was established in 1969 and is funded by the Institute and by partial reimbursement from the governmental agencies served.

In fiscal year 1975, ESS conducted 73 programs for over 2200 Federal employees. Included were 16 field trips and 57 luncheon/dinner discussion meetings, site visits, demonstrations, and other executive development activities.

THE ASSOCIATES PROGRAM (TAP)

is an evolving IEL activity whose emphasis up to now has been the provision of seminars and other forums for legislators and other policy-makers at State capitals. Begun in 1972 with three State educational seminars, TAP now sponsors 21 seminars, all manned by Associates who, on a part-time basis, arrange 5-10 programs annually.

Other TAP efforts—

Maintain a network of State-level "generalists" (Associates) whose ties to IEL in the nation's capital provide rare linkages among Federal and State education policy-setters.

Encourage similar linkages among agencies and coalitions seeking to improve processes of State-level decision-making.

Support attempts of individual State leaders (governors, chief state school officers, legislative committees, etc.) to improve policy-making machinery and to narrow the communications gap which separates political and professional leaders.

OTHER IEL ACTIVITIES

Under a grant from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare's Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, IEL has established an issue development service for consideration and transmission of key policy issues in postsecondary education. The **POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION CONVENING AUTHORITY (PECA)** sponsors conferences, research efforts, task force groups and publications focusing on such issues as institutional licensing, consumer protection, and State financing. During 1975-76 the program will add lifelong learning and public policy to its agenda.

IEL and National Public Radio co-produce the **"OPTIONS IN EDUCATION"** series, heard weekly over NPR's 179 member stations from coast to coast. Voice of America rebroadcasts the 1-hour programs, and IEL makes cassettes and transcripts available at minimum cost. In 1974 "Options" received awards from the Education Writers Association and the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education, Mason-Dixon Division. Funds for "Options in Education" are provided by IEL, National Institute of Education, U.S. Office of Education, Robert S. Clark Foundation, NPR, and other grantors.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON WOMEN IN EDUCATION

Under a contract from Office of the Assistant Secretary for Education, HEW, IEL is currently developing task forces and Issue Papers to formulate action recommendations for policy makers in order to work on eliminating sex bias from education. The topics covered are Title IX; Women's Studies Curriculum; Changing Male Roles; Women in Educational Leadership, Teacher Education; Counselor Education; Women Education and Work; Early Childhood Education; Instructional Materials and Educational Media; A Research Agenda in Sex Role Issues; and Sex Role Issues for Minorities.

The **CAREER EDUCATION POLICY PROJECT (CEPP)** addresses the issues of education, work and society. Funded by the U.S. Office of Education, CEPP uses the resources of other IEL programs—ESS, TAP, "Option"—to inform both policy-makers and the public of the issues in the career education movement.